



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

We think, too, it would be hard to get up a worse definition of density than the following: "The property of matter by virtue of which equal volumes contain different qualities is called *density*." Occasionally the statements are even absurd; as this: "Furnaces are lined with fire-brick to keep the heat in." Several formulæ are introduced without being derived. This is bad pedagogy. But the capital defect of the whole work is its unnecessary magnification of detail, and its entire failure to present anything like a forcible conception of physical science. In appearance the book is unattractive and the illustrations are mostly crude.

It would be unduly optimistic to predict any measure of success for Cooley's *Physics*, and in view of its shortcomings we could not consistently even wish it.

C. HANFORD HENDERSON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The Science of Discourse. By ARNOLD TOMPKINS. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1897.

DISCOURSE as defined in *The Science of Discourse* is a broad term; including all expression by means of language, whether oral or written; and also the process as well as the product of expression. It has, therefore, to do with composition, as well as with literature. The aim of the author in *The Science of Discourse* is twofold: to find an organizing principle that underlies the processes of interpreting and of constructing discourse, and in both processes to apply this principle scientifically.

The arrangement of material in the book is elaborate. Instead of chapters there are numerous divisions and subdivisions. After declaring the organizing principle to be the effective expression of thought in language to a definite, worthy aim, the author proceeds under three large divisions, which follow the three "phases" of discourse—the purpose in discourse, the thought in discourse, and the language in discourse, the bulk of space being given to the thought and the language in discourse. Under the thought in discourse, as discourse processes, description, narration, exposition, and argumentation receive an extended and technical treatment, which occupies nearly a third of the book. Under the language in discourse are treated the qualities of style and the conditions for securing them, then language as an object of perception and its direct and indirect relation to thought. At the close of the third division, under the indirect relation of language to thought, is an elaborate treatment of the figures of speech.

From this statement it appears that the author has simply rearranged under a new classification and treated from a new point of view old material. Much, perhaps too much, of the old subject-matter is found, but in unexpected places. Unity of sentence structure, for instance, is treated under a subdivision of the direct relation of language to thought, and description under thought in discourse. The new point of view infuses into the book what freshness it possesses. The old material is poured into a new mold and looked at from a new angle. A rhetoric written by a man whose interest is evidently in philosophy and in the scientific criticism of literature is a novelty. The bias of the author is clearly seen throughout the book. He tries to be just to composition but fails in the attempt. His strength lies in the interpretation of literature. His treatment of rhetoric as construction is set and perfunctory, made up of gleanings from other writers. The philosophical bias of the author also is evident throughout the book as well as in its general aim.

In spite, however, of these philosophical and scientific interests that result in unusual emphasis of certain phases of his theme, the author succeeds in making his point. His method is in the main scientific, and he gives rules for analyzing and for making discourse. To criticise his purpose is not the aim here. It is still an open question whether literature can be scientifically analyzed into all its elements, and rules formulated for the production of more literature. *The Science of Discourse* represents, according to the author's understanding of them, the views of those who contend that literary criticism and rhetoric should stand among the sciences.

A text-book of rhetoric for high schools and colleges the author calls this book. Granted that one believed in and wished to teach the science of interpretation and construction, is this a good text-book for the purpose? For high schools, certainly not! It is written above the heads of high-school students. To read it understandingly requires at least an elementary knowledge of logic, psychology, and philosophy. Such terms, for example, as concept, judgment, deductive inference, and perception are freely used. Kant's theory of the subjectivity of space, expressed in the author's own words, is introduced casually (top of page 68) as an aid in the treatment of description. Then, too, the presentation of the subject of rhetoric lacks the simplicity, clearness, and grasp of other recent writers, and is full of technical terms. In the treatment of figures even aphæresis and paragoge are included. These objections would apply, though with somewhat less force, against

the use of the book in colleges. A final criticism of the book as a text-book is on the ground of its style. In the little things at least, of the practice of composition the author is weak. His book, in the course of its 300 odd pages, illustrates many of the common faults of composition: incoherent sentence structure, dangling participles, uncertain reference of pronouns and demonstratives, lack of agreement between subject and verb, misuse of words, and poor punctuation—faults hardly excusable in a text-book on rhetoric.

CLARA S. DOOLITTLE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO